



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/802,466 | 03/09/2001 | Paul D. Taylor | P-408 | 7041 |

7590 01/14/2005

Jane Massey Licata, Esquire
Licata & Tyrrell P.C.
66 E. Main Street
Marlton, NJ 08053

EXAMINER

MARVICH, MARIA

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1636

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/802,466

Applicant(s)

TAYLOR ET AL.

Examiner

Maria B Marvich, PhD

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 21 and 26-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 21, 26-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1636

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to an amendment filed 10/20/04. Claims 3, 5, 12-20, 22-25 and 29-33 have been cancelled. Claims 7, 26 and 28 have been amended. Claims 1-2, 4, 6-11, 21 and 26-28 are pending in the application.

Response to Amendment

Any rejection of record in the previous action not addressed in this office action is withdrawn. There are no new grounds of rejection herein and therefore, this action is final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 21 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gjerde et al (US 2003/0165941; see entire document). **This rejection is**

Art Unit: 1636

maintained for reasons of record in the office action mailed 2/13/04 and 7/26/04 and is restated below.

Gjerde et al teach separation of polynucleotides by Matched Ion Polynucleotide Chromatography (MIPC) also referred to as HPLC-based ion pairing Chromatography and furthermore by denaturing MIPC (dMIPC) (page 3, paragraph 0023 and paragraph 0030 and page 4, paragraph 0037). Multivalent cations are removed from all aspects (page 11, paragraph 171). DMIPC involves separation in temperatures ranging from 50°C to about 75°C. Samples are applied to separation media such as silica that support non-polar organic polymers or long chain C1 to C24 hydrocarbon groups bound to inorganic substrate (page 30, paragraph 417-418) and has an average diameter of 1-100 microns (page 28, paragraph 395). The method comprises contacting the separation media with eluting solution A consisting of 0.1 M TEAA pH 7.2 and solution B that consists of 0.1 M TEAA and 25% acetonitrile (page 35, paragraph 0467). The method is performed using computerized controls and a mobile phase flow control means designed to control the flow of solvent and aqueous phases (see e.g. page 7, paragraph 0082-0084). Given that the process involves addition of mobile phase in gradients and multiple steps, the method is best adapted to a batch process (see page 18, paragraph 253). The procedure disclosed by Gjerde et al is the same as that recited in the instant claims and taught in the instant Specification. Therefore, and absent evidence to the contrary, it would reasonably be expected to yield RNA that is substantially free of agents capable of catalyzing degradation of RNA. Because the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing the applicant's product with the products of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference between the claimed products and the products of the prior art (e.g. that the

Art Unit: 1636

products of the prior art do not possess the same material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed product). See *in re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

Claims 7-10, 26 and 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Oefner (US 6,453,244 B1; see entire reference). **This rejection is maintained for reasons of record in the office action mailed 2/13/04 and 7/26/04 and is restated below.**

Given that MIPC also referred to as HPLC-based ion pairing Chromatography is defined in the instant specification as a process for segregating RNA using non-polar reverse phase media wherein the process uses a counterion and an organic solvent (see page 11, line 11-14), the method of Oefner et al can be considered to be MIPC. Oefner teaches elution of RNA with a mobile phase containing an ion-pairing reagent and organic solvent under denaturing conditions such as heat or chemicals (see e.g. abstract). Specifically, Oefner teaches isolation using ion pairing reverse phase HPLC in the presence of a counterion and organic solvent (see column 11, line 65 through column 12, line 12). The solid support is comprised of silica and the mobile phase is comprised of TEAA and acetonitrile (see e.g. column 4, lines 7-29). Denaturing conditions include temperatures up to 70°C to 80°C (see e.g. column 4, line 46-53). The separation media has an average diameter of 1-100 microns (column 11, line 24-25), the concentration of TEAA is about 0.05 to 1.0 Molar and about 25% acetonitrile (see e.g. column 12, line 31-55). The present invention can be used in the separation of RNA (see e.g. column 13, line 1-20) and the procedure can be used for large numbers of samples to be analyzed (see e.g. column 14, line 40-48). Columns comprised of PEEK are used (see e.g. column 8, line 28-45). The procedure disclosed by Oefner et al is the same as that recited in the instant claims and

Art Unit: 1636

taught in the instant Specification. Therefore, and absent evidence to the contrary, it would reasonably be expected to yield RNA that is substantially free of agents capable of catalyzing degradation of RNA. Because the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing the applicant's product with the products of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference between the claimed products and the products of the prior art (e.g. that the products of the prior art do not possess the same material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed product). See *in re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

Response to Arguments

Applicants traverse the claim rejection under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Gjerde et al (US 20030165941) and Oefner (US 6,453,244) on pages 11-12 of the amendment filed 10/20/04. Applicants argue that the cited references are silent with regard to the separation of a polynucleotide molecule from any other type of macromolecule such as an RNA degrading agent thereby stabilizing the RNA against degradation and therefore do not anticipate the instant invention. Applicants argue that the invention has the unexpected finding that conditions, which are suitable for separating polynucleotides from each other, are also generally suitable for separating an RNA molecule from an agent capable of catalyzing the degradation of RNA.

Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While, applicants wish to distinguish the instant invention from that of Oefner and Gjerde et al, applicants have provided no evidence that the methods of Oefner and Gjerde et al would differ from that of the instant invention except to state that the method steps of the instant

Art Unit: 1636

invention result in separation of the polynucleotides from molecules capable of degrading them. Absent evidence to the contrary, the method steps of the instant invention are identical to those of Gjerde et al and Oefner and by applicants' own admission, it is an unexpected result that following the method steps results not only in separation of polynucleotides from one another but also from other macromolecules. Therefore, following the method steps of Oefner and Gjerde et al would similarly result in not only separation of the polynucleotides from one another but also from other macromolecules.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oefner (US 6,453,244 B1; see entire reference) in view of Petro et al (6,260,407; see entire reference). **This rejection is maintained for reasons of record in the office action mailed 2/13/04 and 7/26/04 and is restated below.**

Applicants claim a method for stabilizing an RNA molecule against degradation in which a solution of RNA and an agent capable of degrading the RNA and a counter ion are applied to a non-polar separation surface. The RNA is eluted from the separation medium by a mobile phase comprising an organic solvent in which the mobile phase is controlled by a mobile phase flow control using MIPC.

The teachings of Oefner are described above and are applied as before except; Oefner does not teach a mobile phase control means that is controlled by a computer.

Petro et al teaches that the mobile phase of a liquid chromatography system is controlled by a flow control means, which in turn is controlled by a computer. Specifically, the mobile phase solutions are stored in reservoirs and have dedicated pumps that are controlled by computer (see e.g. figure 6 and bridging paragraph column 37-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the computer controls taught by Petro et al with the method of separation of RNA molecules taught by Oefner because Oefner teaches that it is within the ordinary skill of the art to separate RNA using non-polar separation medium in which a mobile phase is passed through to elute RNA and because Petro et al teach that it is within the ordinary skill of the art to control the mobile phase using control means and computers. One would have been motivated to do so in order to receive the expected benefit of generating a high-throughput automated sampling system (see Petro et al, e.g. abstract). Based upon the teachings of the cited references, the high skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, and absent evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to result in the claimed invention.

Claims 11 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oefner (US 6,453,244 B1; see entire reference) in view of Petro et al (6,260,407; see entire reference) further in view of Sheridan and Sheridan (Scientist 3(4):23 Feb 20, 1989; see entire document). **This rejection is maintained for reasons of record in the office action mailed 2/13/04 and 7/26/04 and is restated below.**

Applicants claim a method for stabilizing an RNA molecule against degradation in which a solution of RNA and an agent capable of degrading the RNA and a counter ion are applied to a non-polar separation surface. The RNA is eluted from the separation medium by a mobile phase comprising an organic solvent in which the mobile phase is controlled by a mobile phase flow control using MIPC under conditions free of multivalent cations.

The teachings of Oefner and Petro et al are described above and are applied as before except; neither Oefner nor Petro teach that conditions of separation are free of multivalent cations.

Sheridan and Sheridan et al teach a Metal-Free column system for use in chromatography in which the recovery of biopolymers is improved (see e.g. page 2, paragraph 5). Sheridan and Sheridan use for example PEEK (polyether ester ketone), which is a non-metal polymer (page 2, paragraph 5). Metals are considered the source of multivalent cations.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the conditions taught by Oefner with the metal-free conditions taught by Sheridan and Sheridan because Oefner teach that it is within the ordinary skill of the art to use PPEK columns for separation of RNA and because Sheridan and Sheridan teach that it is within the ordinary skill of the art to use metal-free conditions in chromatography. One would have been motivated to do so in order to receive the expected benefit of improved recovery that occurs with metal-free conditions. Based upon the teachings of the cited references, the high skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, and absent evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to result in the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

Applicants traverse the claim rejection under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Oefner (US 6,453,244) on pages 12-14 of the amendment filed 10/20/04. Applicants' argue that the primary reference does not anticipate the present invention as discussed above and therefore does not make obvious the instant invention either alone or in the presence of secondary references.

Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 21 and 26-28 are rejected.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 1636

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maria B Marvich, PhD whose telephone number is (571)-272-0774. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel, PhD can be reached on (571)-272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

January 7, 2004


GERRY LEFFERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER